

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 2-11, 13-24, 26 and 27 have been withdrawn by the Examiner. By this Amendment, claims 1-8 and 10-27 are amended for clarity and consistency.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 12, 15, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 15, and 28 are amended for clarity and consistency. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 12, 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gilmour (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,709). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 25, Gilmour fails to disclose a computer or a recording medium containing a program involving a document feature computer executable extraction part that extracts operator-specific documents, and that extracts a plurality of features of operator-specific documents, and a job feature computer executable extraction part that extracts job features from the plurality of features of the operator-specific documents. Stated another way, Gilmour fails to disclose the grouping of documents according to a specific operator, and then the extraction of job features from that grouping of documents.

Gilmour discloses a process that first extracts terms from all documents in a database and then, following the term extraction of the entire database, determines which documents are associated with particular users. See Gilmour at col. 14, lines 59-65, and Fig. 8. Gilmour does not disclose a process in which documents are first identified for a particular operator, and then involving the extraction of features from that limited set of documents for that particular operator.

Gilmour's process fails to achieve one of the purposes of the invention, which is to permit the analysis of job features contained in documents specific to a particular operator. See, e.g., specification at page 10, line 21, to page 11, line 4.

For the foregoing reasons, Gilmour fails to disclose all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 25. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven W. Allis
Registration No. 50,532

JAO:SWA/sxb

Date: March 30, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--